

7/11/10/54/12
14 JUN 1994

**LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES**

SUBJECT: Electrical Inspections for Existing Homes by Using
NFPA-73

PLACE: CPSC Headquarters, Bethesda, MD

DATE OF MEETING: June 7, 1994

LOG OF ENTRY SOURCE: Alberta Mills *am*

DATE OF ENTRY: June 8, 1994

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Bill King, ESEE
Ted Gordon, ESEE
Kim Long, EPFA
Linda Edwards, ESEE
Larry Moskowitz, ESEL
Chuck Smith, ECPA
Alberta Mills, ESEE

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Edward S. Charkey, American Insurance Services Group
Doug Geralde, Canadian Standards Association (CSA), IAEI
Siavash Farvardin, National Conference of States on Building
Codes and Standards
Bob Dunigan, National Association of Electrical
Distributors
Vic Ferrante, Dept. Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
Larry Miller, National Electrical Manufacturers Association
(NEMA)
John Caloggero, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
Nick Wakeman, Product Safety Letter (PSL)
Bob Petty, Housemaster

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss application of, and modifications or revisions to, NFPA 73, Residential Electrical Maintenance Code for One and Two Family Dwellings. Mr. King brought the meeting to order by discussing his recent use of NFPA 73 in performing home inspections of several row houses in Baltimore. He noted that NFPA 73 was very helpful in accomplishing this task.

Mr. Gordon mentioned that copies of NFPA-73 were sent about six weeks ago to all state designees to be passed on to appropriate agencies. Response has been slow in coming but 13 states have responded so far. CPSC is in the process of sending a follow up letter to encourage promotion of NFPA 73 by state agencies.

Mr. Geralde from CSA and IAEI stated that the main objections they hold towards NFPA 73 are that the terms used were too general and vague. Mr. Charkey's objections were that the code did not specify qualifications for inspectors, nor include requirements for removing box covers or checking conductor insulation. He would like to have these incorporated before NFPA 73 is adopted by states. He also noted that he would like to see revisions in less than three years.

Mr. King also talked about his visit with the San Francisco Fire Department and their reaction to the NFPA 73. He stated that according to Fire Inspector Ballard the proper approach for adoption of NFPA-73 would be at the state level. Mr. Ballard would be willing to testify before the state for this purpose.

Mr. Petty commented that unless the state approach is taken, the purpose would not be achieved. Mr. Dunigan inquired as to whether research has taken place to determine if any states require home inspections and maybe use those states as models.

The group agreed that another approach may be to contact lending institutions about requiring electrical inspections as they now do for termite inspections. Mr. King mentioned that he has tried to reach someone at Fanny Mae in order to discuss NFPA 73 but was unable to make a substantial contact. Mr. Charkey also mentioned that, although contacting insurance companies may be another approach, these companies refrain from such dealings due to the appearance of collusion. Mr. King also said that according to the individual he spoke with from ITT Hartford Insurance, one individual company cannot speak for the industry. Mr. Dunigan suggested approaching the VA since they also loan money for homes.

Mr. Ferrante stated that HUD's position is to make homes affordable and that upgrading and inspections contradict that position. In response to that, Mr. Petty stressed that homes should not have to burn down in order to spare a few dollars.

The meeting ended with a consensus on three action items. The first one is to request that the NFPA 73 Committee reconvene to address new developments. A TIA will be requested as quickly as possible. A request of a 3 year revision cycle will be made rather than the 5. Mr. King will draft a letter to lending institutions such as Fanny Mae and the VA. The last item was that Mr. Charkey will contact the insurance industry on behalf of this task group. The meeting was adjourned with a reconvening date of October 11, 1994.